

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Bryan G. Yamamoto

Assignee: Mirapoint, Inc.

Title: Dual-Frame User Interface On Generic Client  
Software

Serial No.: 09/823,425 File Date: March 30, 2001

Examiner: Thong H. Vu Art Unit: 2142

Docket No.: MPT-001

-----  
Date: September 19, 2006

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO THE FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Initial Comments:

Claims 1-14 and 17-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-14 and 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,452,609 (Katinsky).

No claims are amended herein.

PENDING CLAIMS

1. (Previously Presented) A data display system implemented by configuring generic client software to resemble a portion of a display window associated with custom client software, the data display system comprising:

    a data display frame configured to display a current data record;

    a data list frame configured to display a first set of data identifiers and having a current data identifier marker for indicating a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record;

    a data display frame lock that indicates whether the data display frame contains a valid data page; and

    a data list frame lock that indicates whether the data list frame contains a valid data page,

    wherein the data display frame and the data list frame facilitate accessing server software over a wide area network, and wherein the data display frame and the data list frame are synchronized over the wide area network using the data display frame lock and the data list frame lock.

2. (Original) The data display system of Claim 1, further comprising a parent frame containing the data display frame and the data list frame.

3. (Original) The data display system of Claim 2, wherein the parent frame further comprises a plurality of command scripts.

4. (Original) The data display system of Claim 3, wherein the data display frame further comprises a next button

associated with a next command script from the plurality of command scripts.

5. (Original) The data display system of Claim 4, wherein the data display frame further comprises a previous button associated with a previous command script from the plurality of command scripts.

6. (Previously Presented) The data display system of Claim 4, wherein the next command script is configured to request a new current data record.

7. (Original) The data display system of Claim 6, wherein the next command script is also configured to update the current data identifier marker.

8. (Original) The data display system of Claim 6, wherein the next command script is also configured to request a second set of data identifiers when the current data record corresponds to a last data identifier in the first set of data identifiers.

9. (Original) The data display system of Claim 1, wherein the current data identifier marker is an arrow.

10. (Original) The data display system of Claim 1, wherein the current data identifier marker is signified by highlighting the current data identifier.

11. (Original) The data display system of Claim 1, wherein the data list frame includes a set of status markers for the set of data identifiers.

12. (Original) The data display system of Claim 1, wherein the data display system is an email client.

13. (Original) The data display system of Claim 1, wherein the generic client software is a web browser.

14. (Previously Presented) A method of configuring generic client software to synchronize a first frame with a second frame, the method comprising:

creating a parent frame including the first frame and the second frame, wherein the first and second frames resemble a portion of a display window created using custom client software;

storing a plurality of commands for the first frame and the second frame in the parent frame;

storing a plurality of variables for the first frame and the second frame in the parent frame;

displaying a first set of data identifiers in the first frame;

displaying a current data record in the second frame;

placing a current data record identifier next to a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record; and

storing indicators of lock states for the first frame and the second frame in the parent frame,

wherein storing the indicators of lock states and the plurality of commands and variables allows synchronization of the first and second frames being sent over a wide area network.

15. (Cancelled)

16. (Cancelled)

17. (Previously Presented) The method of Claim 14, further comprising highlighting the current data identifier corresponding to the current data record.

18. (Previously Presented) The method of Claim 14, further comprising displaying a set of status markers corresponding to the set of data identifiers in the first frame.

19. (Previously Presented) The method of Claim 14, wherein the plurality of commands includes a next command.

20. (Original) The method of Claim 19, further comprising requesting a new current data record when the next command is activated.

21. (Original) The method of Claim 20, further comprising, updating a current data identifier marker when the next command is activated.

22. (Original) The method of Claim 20, further comprising requesting a second set of data identifiers when the next command is activated and the current data record corresponds to a last data identifier in the first set of data identifiers.

23. (Original) The method of Claim 14, wherein the first frame is configured to display a list of email headers.

24. (Original) The method of Claim 23, wherein the second frame is configured to display an email.

25. (Original) The method of Claim 14, wherein the generic client software is a web browser.

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated June 21, 2006, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire September 21, 2006.

Claims 1-14 and 17-25 Are Patentable Over Katinsky

A. Katinsky Fails To Teach Data Display System Recited In Claims 1-13

Claim 1 recites:

A data display system implemented by configuring generic client software to resemble a portion of a display window associated with custom client software, the data display system comprising:

a data display frame configured to display a current data record;

a data list frame configured to display a first set of data identifiers and having a current data identifier marker for indicating a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record;

a data display frame lock that indicates whether the data display frame contains a valid data page; and

a data list frame lock that indicates whether the data list frame contains a valid data page,

wherein the data display frame and the data list frame facilitate accessing server software over a wide area network, and wherein the data display frame and the data list frame are synchronized over the wide area network using the data display frame lock and the data list frame lock.

In contrast, Katinsky teaches a media access web page generated by an Internet site that is particularly suited for accessing multimedia streams. Col. 3, lines 43-45. As shown in FIG. 1, the media access web page 10 has four functional areas: a media icon access panel 12, a sequencer 14, an object player 16, and a site-driven area 18. Col. 4, lines 7-10. The media icon access panel 12 organizes media icons into a hierarchical outline or list, and supports searches for media objects. Col.

4, lines 10-12. The sequencer 14 allows the user to select media icons from the media icon access panel 12, and to create and modify one or more user defined play lists. Col. 4, lines 12-14. The object player 16 plays the media objects in the order defined by the play list. Col. 4, lines 15-16. In addition, the object player 16 can control the play list and the individual media objects in the play list. Col. 4, lines 16-17. The site-driven area 18 presents site-driven graphics synchronized with streaming content that responds to user actions and user selected content. Col. 4, lines 18-20.

Notably, Katinsky teaches nothing about configuring generic client software to resemble a portion of a display window associated with custom client software as recited in the preamble of Claim 1. Applicant submits that this preamble is necessary to "give life, meaning, and vitality" to Claim 1. Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co., 182 F.3d 1298, 1305, 51 USPQ2d 1161, 1165-66 (Fed. Cir. 1999). To support this statement, Applicant provides (1) a discussion of a wide area network, (2) a discussion of server, custom client, and generic client software, and (3) a discussion of frames and synchronization issues. Applicant provides citations to the Specification for all discussions.

#### (1) Discussion of a Wide Area Network

As taught by Applicant, network applications typically refer to computer applications on a first computer that interact with other computer applications running on a second computer. Specification, paragraph [0004]. FIGURE 1 illustrates a server computer 110 with server software 115 that is coupled to a client computer 140 with custom client software 145 via a local area network 120. See, Specification, paragraph [0006]. In turn, local area network 120 is coupled to a wide area network

150. Specification, paragraph [0006]. A client computer 160 is coupled to wide area network 150, typically through a modem or another local area network. Specification, paragraph [0006]. The data bandwidth of local area network 120 is typically between 10 and 100 megabits per second, whereas the data bandwidth between client computer 160 and server computer 110 can be much slower, e.g. 56 kilobits per second. Specification, paragraph [0006].

(2) Discussion of Server, Custom Client, & Generic Client Software

Generally, server software 115 runs on server computer 110 to allow custom client software to access the desired data records. Specification, paragraph [0007]. On client computer 140, custom client software 145 is installed to communicate and transfer the desired data records with server software 115. Specification, paragraph [0007]. For example, if the data records are email, server software 115 is a mail server such as Microsoft Exchange and custom client software 145 is a mail client such as Microsoft Outlook. Specification, paragraph [0007]. Generic client software 165 communicates with server software 115 using industry standard protocols, such as HTML and Javascript. Specification, paragraph [0008]. Server software 115 can control generic client software to simulate some of the features of custom client software 145.

(3) Discussion of Frames and Synchronization Issues

FIGURE 2 illustrates a simplified display window 200 from custom client software 145. FIGURE 3(a) illustrates a display window 300 from generic client software 165. Notably, display window 300 includes a data list frame 340 and a data record display frame 350. In general, each frame can be treated as a

separate data page. Specification, paragraph [0027]. The use of frames 340/350 can be synchronized, thereby allowing generic client software 165 to successfully replicate features of custom client software 145 over wide area network 150.

Synchronization of these frames is difficult because of latency between the network connection between server computer 110 and client computer 160. Specification, paragraph [0030]. That is, server software 115 is generally programmed to assume that all new information from generic client software 165 is sent after receipt of the last data page sent by server software 115. Specification, paragraph [0030]. However, due to network congestion, the last data page may be delayed. Specification, paragraph [0030]. Thus, generic client software 165 (under control of an impatient user) may issue additional requests while using a data page that should have been replaced by the data page sent by server software 115. Specification, paragraph [0030].

Transfer protocol used on the wide area network can also result in loss of synchronization. Specification, paragraph [0031]. Specifically, data transmitted over the wide area network are broken up into small packets and therefore can arrive at the destination (via the wide area network) too slowly for generic client software 165 to update multiple frames without errors. Specification, paragraph [0031].

The use of parent frame 330 and its constituent components solve the latency and transfer protocol issues associated with synchronization. Specification, paragraph [0032]. For example, referring to FIGURE 5, data list frame lock 540 and data record display frame lock 550 are indicators of whether data list frame 340 and data record display frame 350, respectively, contain valid data pages. Specification, paragraph [0035]. If both data list frame lock 540 and data record display frame lock 550

are in the unlock state, then the appropriate data record from server software 115 is requested. Specification, paragraph [0036]. Otherwise, the request is placed in a command queue 530. Specification, paragraph [0036].

Based on the above discussions, Applicant submits that the claim preamble should be construed as if in the balance of the claim. Katinsky fails to disclose or suggest the recited configuring of the generic client software to resemble a portion of a display window associated with custom client software.

Moreover, Katinsky fails to disclose or suggest the recited data display frame lock. The Final Office Action cites the size lock discussed in col. 6, lines 46-61, the lock/unlock button discussed in col. 7, lines 1-15, and the currently valid media object discussed in col. 15, lines 16-42 as teaching this limitation. Applicant traverses this characterization. Col. 6, lines 46-61 teaches that an image size lock button can be clicked to set and release an image size lock that restricts the maximum size of the image display window 80. Therefore, this image size lock button does not indicate whether a data display frame contains a valid data page. Col. 7, lines 1-15 teaches that the image size lock, image shade, image swap buttons and hide video on the handle 90 of the image display window 80 are repeated below the sequencer 14 as lock/unlock button 68, an open/close button 66, an away button 69, and a hide/show video button 64, respectively. Therefore, this lock/unlock button 68, which corresponds to an image size lock button, also does not indicate whether a data display frame contains a valid data page. Col. 15, lines 16-42 teach that the server may be configured to return a play list that includes only the currently valid media objects. Therefore, this configuration

teaches nothing about a data display frame lock that indicates whether the data display frame contains a valid data page.

Moreover, Katinsky fails to disclose or suggest the recited data list frame lock. The Final Office Action cites the content database discussed in col. 9, lines 18-34 as teaching this limitation. Applicant traverses this characterization. Specifically, col. 9, lines 18-34 teaches that the content database can include, for each item of content, the media type, a uniform resource code, a short text description, the frame rate, duration, image size, author, copyright source name, source web site, sponsor name, sponsor web site, and a description/price of item. Katinsky teaches that the content database can be updated to provide new media objects and no longer available media objects can be removed. Therefore, this content database description teaches nothing about a data list frame lock that indicates whether the data list frame contains a valid data page.

Moreover, Katinsky fails to disclose or suggest that the data display frame and the data list frame are synchronized over the wide area network (WAN) using the data display frame lock and the data list frame lock. The Final Office Action cites col. 4, lines 7-25 and col. 7, lines 15-50 as teaching this limitation. Applicant traverses this characterization. Specifically, col. 4, lines 7-25 teach that the site-driven area 18 presents site-driven graphics synchronized with streaming content that responds to user actions and user selected content. However, this site-driven area 18 teaches nothing about synchronization of frames using the data display frame lock and the data list frame lock.

Because Katinsky fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's recited data display system, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2-13 depend from Claim 1 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 1. Based on these reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-13.

Moreover, Claim 2 recites that the data display system further includes a parent frame that contains the data display frame and the data list frame. The Final Office Action cites the list/sublist described in col. 5, lines 15-25 as teaching this limitation. Applicant traverses this characterization. Specifically, col. 5, lines 15-25 teaches that unchecking a checkbox 54 to the left of the media icon copy 40 causes that media object to be skipped when the play list is played (thereby permitting a user to select a subset of the play list 50 to be played). This unchecking has nothing to do with a parent frame. Therefore, Applicant requests further reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 2.

Moreover, Claim 12 recites that the data display system is an email client. The Final Office Action states that Katinsky teaches that this is an inherent feature of the Internet application. Applicant traverses this characterization. Specifically, Katinsky teaches that when a recipient selects a delivered electronic mail, the displayed text includes a button linking to a mail query ASP form on the server. Col. 15, lines 28-31. When the button is selected, a browser is launched and connects to the server. Col. 15, lines 32-35. An HTML page is assembled appropriate to the browser configuration to display the media icons from the mailed play list only if the server determines the browser is configured to be capable of playing the media objects in the play list. Col. 15, lines 35-38. This display of media icons fails to teach anything about the recited data display frame, data list frame, data display frame lock, and data list frame lock (recited in Claim 1 from which Claim 12

depends). Because Katinsky fails to teach that the data display system is an email client, Applicant requests further reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 12.

B. Katinsky Fails To Teach Method As Recited In Claims 14 and 17-25

Claim 14 recites:

A method of configuring generic client software to synchronize a first frame with a second frame, the method comprising:

creating a parent frame including the first frame and the second frame, wherein the first and second frames resemble a portion of a display window created using custom client software;

storing a plurality of commands for the first frame and the second frame in the parent frame;

storing a plurality of variables for the first frame and the second frame in the parent frame;

displaying a first set of data identifiers in the first frame;

displaying a current data record in the second frame;

placing a current data record identifier next to a current data identifier corresponding to the current data record; and

storing indicators of lock states for the first frame and the second frame in the parent frame,

wherein storing the indicators of lock states and the plurality of commands and variables allows synchronization of the first and second frames being sent over a wide area network.

The Final Office Action states that Claims 14 and 17-25 contain the identical limitations set forth in Claims 1-13, respectively. Applicant traverses this characterization. For example, Claim 14 recites first, second, and parent frames, all of which are not recited in Claim 1. Other claims in the set of Claims 14 and 17-25 include limitations not found in Claims 1-13 (some provided below by example).

synchronize a first frame with a second frame) should be construed as if in the balance of the claim for substantially the same reasons presented above for Claim 1. Katinsky fails to disclose or suggest the recited configuring of the generic client software.

Katinsky also fails to disclose or suggest the recited parent frame. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to remarks presented above for Claim 2 as to why Katinsky does not teach a parent frame.

Moreover, Katinsky also fails to disclose or suggest the recited storing indicators of lock states for the first and second frames in the parent frame. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to remarks presented above for Claim 1 as to why Katinsky does not teach anything about the lock states of frames.

Moreover, Katinsky also fails to disclose or suggest that storing the indicators of lock states and the plurality of commands and variables allows synchronization of the first and second frames being sent over the a wide area network. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to remarks presented above for Claim 1 as to why Katinsky does not teach using these lock states to synchronize frames over a WAN.

Because none of these passages disclose or suggest Applicant's recited method, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 14.

Claims 17-25 depend from Claim 14 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 14. Based on these reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 17-25.

Moreover, Claim 23 recites that the first frame is configured to display a list of email headers. Katinsky fails to disclose or suggest this limitation. The Final Office Action

fails to provide any citation in Katinsky to reject this limitation. Therefore, Applicant requests further reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 23.

Moreover, Claim 24 recites that the second frame is configured to display an email. Katinsky fails to disclose or suggest this limitation. The Final Office Action fails to provide any citation in Katinsky to reject this limitation. Therefore, Applicant requests further reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 24.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-14 and 17-25 are pending in the present application. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at 408-451-5907 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No.: 22888

Jeanette S. Harms  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 35,537